DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 032 170 RC 003 622

By-Kuvlesky, William P.

A Synthetic Overview of Research on Rural Youth's Projections for Occupational and Educational Attainment: A Progress Report.

Spons Agency-Texas A and M Univ., College Station. Agricultural Experiment Station.

Pub Date 69

Note-61p.; Paper presented at the Rural Sociological Society Meeting (San Francisco, California, August 28-31, 1969)

EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.15

Descriptors-*Academic Achievement, Bibliographic Citations, Educational Objectives, Intelligence, *Occupational Aspiration, Racial Differences, *Research Reviews (Publications), Rural Urban Differences, *Rural Youth, Self Concept, Socioeconomic Status, *Synthesis, Vocational Interests

A synthesis of research studies pertaining to the status projections of rural youth is given in this report. In this context, status projection refers to occupational and educational aspirations and expectations. The three major sections of the report are: (1) an overview of current theory, concepts, and measurements; (2) a comprehensive review of the empirical research studies conducted between 1954 and 1969 presented in table form; and (3) appendices containing bibliographic lists of research reports, literature pertaining to theories relevant to status projection, and published syntheses of research on occupational and/or education projections of rural youth. (TL)

ED032170

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A SYNTHETIC OVERVIEW OF RESEARCH ON RURAL YOUTH'S PROJECTIONS FOR OCCUPATIONAL AND EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT: A PROGRESS REPORT*

William P. Kuvlesky
(With the assistance of Jane Grumbles)
Texas A&M University

*Presented to the Rural Sociological Society's Research Committee on Education and Occupational Behavior at the 1969 Annual Meetings of the Society in San Francisco. Development of this report was supported by the Texas Agricultural Experiment Station as a contribution to research project H-2611.

RC003622

INTRODUCTION

Most of you know that over the past several years I have been sporadically working out a grand inductive scheme to locate and codify past research on youth's status projections. As a consequence, my research group at Texas A&M has developed a set of comprehensive bibliographic listings on the subject and have begun to sort these out in selectively structured sets of annotations.[1] This paper represents the start of a third stage of effort, building logically on the sets of annotations we have developed on rural youth toward a comprehensive synthesis of research results.

I have subtitled this presentation, "Progress Report." A thorough codification and synthesis of research findings--including conceptual and methodological evaluations--and the ingegration of evolving empirical generalizations within succeedingly higher levels of abstract theoretical statements will require the efforts of a number of sociologists over a considerable period of time. This overview represents my current position in moving toward this larger goal.

This effort, at best, will provide a stimulus and some direction for a significantly broad effort toward inductive integration. At the very least, the summaries of research findings and the bibliographic listings of relevant literature should provide useful sources of information for other researchers interested in the problem area.

Others have attempted syntheses of research findings about rural youth's aspirations and expectations--the most significant of these I have listed in Appendix D. None of these represent a systematic attempt to integrate all or even most relevant knowledge. They tend to be narrow in scope and/or dated. Why has not more effort been given to this task? Because there is pain involved in trying

to work through the morass of idea-language inconsistencies, implicit assumptions, unreported or unfathomable procedures, and varying modes of variable measurement. It is much easier to be a grand theorist, or an abstract deductive type testing crucial hypotheses, or even a bare-faced empiricist of the operations type than a synthesizer sociologist in this jungle of fuzzy ideas and endlessly variable operations. Yet, I firmly believe that synthesis should have high priority in that it can provide the middle ground to establish solid and systematic theories and give more direction to our research thrusts. Certainly, we have accumulated a mountain of observations in this area.

In orienting myself to the problem at hand, I asked myself what we have accomplished over these several years in reference to theoretical, conceptual, and measurement developments and in respect to the generation of significant empirical generalizations. The remainder of the paper represents my attempts to answer these questions through a largely inductive effort of reviewing all available empirical materials pertaining to the occupational and educational projections of rural youth known to me. Before digging into the mountain of empirical observation I mentioned previously, I intend to briefly overview the current state of our theory, concepts, and measurements.

THEORETICAL SIGNIFICANCE

The strong atheoretical and idiographic tendencies that have been traditionally characteristic of rural sociology are clearly evident in the accumulation of 20 years research on status projections of rural youth. Although a number of theoretical statements at various levels of abstraction relevant to aspirations and expectations were developed before and during the accumulation of this substantial body

of research knowledge , few reports of this phenomena involving rural youth have either evolved from or been related to the main stream of sociological or any other kind of theory. As an example, Merton's provocative middle-range theory of "social structure and anomie" contains the idea of aspirations and striving for success as a critical element. Even though this theory was developed prior to the accumulation of most research on status projections of rural youth and was widely discussed and utilized by researchers dealing with urban youth and deviant behavior, it has hardly been mentioned by rural sociologists. The developmental theories of Ginzberg, Roe, and Holland, and the more abstract theories of Parsons have received little attention from rural sociologists. In fact, most cogent theoretical statements on the subject have been very infrequently cited by rural sociologists in reporting research findings. Consequently, I have provided a list of some of these statements in order to hopefully stimulate your interest--see Appendix C.

Obviously there are noteworthy exceptions to this generalization; for instance, note Haller's work on personality attributes,[2] Sewell's efforts on community types and SES,[3] Straus' investigations of family socialization of work roles and attitudes,[4] Slocum's efforts on reference groups and self-image,[5] and Schwarzweller's studies relating values to status projections.[6] Perhaps the most promising effort toward systematic theoretical formulation joined with observation is represented by the current attempts of Sewell and Haller to develop integrative path models to be tested through longitudinal research designs.[7] However, even in these cases the theories utilized consist of propositions at a very low level of abstraction, lacking connections with more inclusive statements at successively higher levels of abstract theory. In conclusion, the large body of research findings on status projections

of rural youth has not by and large been born of theory or successfully related to it. Consequently, this research has contributed very little to the testing and development of abstract theory.

Of course, it can be argued that theory development in and of itself is of little value. This certainly is true of theory that is not established in reference to empirical observation. On the other hand, our research efforts tend to be eclectic and lacking in accumulative efficiency and predictive power as a consequence of our lack of a general, guiding frame of reference. This situation to a large extent accounts for the conceptual ambiguity and imprecision that exist and for the sizeable gaps in our research knowledge pertaining to the dynamics of status projection development and how these phenomena relate to status attainment.[8]

CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT

I do not intend to spend much time here reviewing the state of conceptualization involved in the body of research under consideration. This subject has been rather thoroughly discussed in several recent publications and journal articles in Rural Sociology.[9] However, I would like to indicate that in my judgment the problem of conceptual clarification and specification is receiving considerably more attention and conscious effort than was the case several years ago. Research reported over the last few years demonstrates a conscious and deliberate effort to explicitly indicate the dimension or dimensions of projective phenomena being investigated.

Haller and Miller's 1963 bulletin, The Occupational Aspiration Scale: Theory, Structure, and Correlates, which is probably the most thorough and systematic statement on the conceptualization of occupational projections in existence, deserves much of the credit for this happy state. This publication is the most widely quoted

piece of work on youth projections appearing in recent journal articles representing several disciplines and has influenced many toward conceiving of projections as a unidimensional hierarchy of alternatives with "idealistic" and "realistic" polar limits.

While the distinction between projections involving desired ("idealistic") and anticipated ("realistic") status elements is consistently recognized in current efforts, little data has been generated in reference to several other analytically seperable elements that have merit in my opinion: anticipatory goal deflection and strength of orientation (defined as intensity of aspiration and certainty of expectation). Important variations in these phenomena by other important variables have been documented in the tables overviewing research results which are presented later.[10]

Several colleagues--Norval Glenn (University of Texas) and Rumaldo Juarez (Texas A&M)--have suggested that our conceptual apparatus regarding status projections needs modification in order to take into consideration intention as well as desire and anticipation.[11] This is a potentially valuable idea and is deserving of consideration by those anticipating new research.

In my opinion, the greatest conceptual lack facing us today lies in our tendency to view particular kinds of status projections (say job aspirations, for instance) as existing separate and apart from others. Although it has been two decades since Merton offered the idea of aspirations existing in more or less integrated sets--which may vary in the types of goals included as well as in the valuation of these goals--that he labeled "aspirational frame of reference", the empirical utility of the idea has never really been put to the test until very recently in investigations by Kuvlesky and Upham and, more adequately, by Pelham.[12] These analyses demonstrate that many youth maintain what appears to be a rationally ordered set of goal levels

across a number of status areas and that youth do valuate the different goals in patterned ways. Undoubtedly more research in this vein is being carried out (see Appendix B) and, since this conception has been incorporated into a broad southern regional effort, "S-6", we will undoubtedly gain more evidence with which to evaluate its utility over the next several years. Certainly one aspect of these projected status sets that needs exploring is to what extent the constituent elements are sequentially perceived and ordered into in a means-ends system. To a limited degree in reference to occupational and educational projections, Sewell and Haller are testing this idea in reference to their path model.[13]

MEASUREMENT

Probably the greatest impediment to effectively synthesizing results in this problem area is the wide variation in observation procedures and measurements used. This is often coupled with the unfortunate tendency for some researchers to offer inadequate descriptions of the stiumuls questions, administration procedures, and measurement categories used.[14] While the problem of adequate reporting could be rather quickly resolved, the problem involving variability of procedures and measures is unresolvable until we can reach some consensus among ourselves on the "best" ways to make observations and measure their results. Again, as was true with conceptualization, the single best discussion of these problems can be found in Haller and Miller's bulletin, The Occupational Aspirations Scale. They provide an excellent statement on the important considerations involved in development of stimulus questions eliciting responses for aspiration and expectation and provide a thorough discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of various response alternative options.[15]

The problem of measurement involves at least two major facets, outside of the question regarding mode of contact with the respondent which I don't wmat to get into here.[16] One aspect involves the question of what is being measured and centers on

the constituent elements making up the stimulus question. One critical dimension of variability occurring in reference to make-up of stimulus questions that has not received enough consideration from researchers is the time range built in for the projection of status attainment. In the past, some researchers have specified short time periods ("after finishing high school"), others have used long time periods ("when you are 40" or "most of your life"), and still others have used questions indefinite in reference to time projected ("What job would you most like to have?"). Obviously these variations in the stimulus probably influence variability in responses.

Another major problem involves the nature and degree of differentiation involved in measuring "levels" of the social rank element involved in occupational or educational statuses projected. A number of alternatives have been used. In reference to occupation, one of two alternatives, or some modification of one or the other, is used: NH prestige scores or the Alba Edwards census classification scheme.[17] What is more, the responses are grouped in varying ways from study to study along both scales. Very often in reference to both modes of measurements various dichotomous categories are used to represent "high" and "low" levels: "white collar"-"blue collar", "professional"-"other", or "NH 70 and more" versus "NH less than 70." These intermode and intramode variations in measurement, particularly when not accompanied with more detailed descriptive information, seriously impede the accumulative power of our research efforts. The increasingly widespread use of the Haller and Miller "OAS" instrument points to the possibility of attaining some uniformity in measurement of occupational projection levels.[18] Although I am not satisfied that this instrument serves all of our needs, when used alone, it is certainly the most balanced, sophisticated, and reliable one in existence.

Although education status levels are somewhat easier to measure unambiguously as compared with occupation, important variability exists in our procedures. The vast majority of researchers reporting on levels of educational aspirations and expectations have focused their analysis on dichotomous categories: college (high) and noncollege (low), Tables 3, 4, and 6. Even given this commonality, it is not always possible to determine exactly whether college level refers to some college or college graduation. In addition, this practice, while probably increasing predictive efficiency, overlooks significant social distinctions in levels of mobility both within the college class (level and type of study)[19] and among those projecting less than college level attainments.[20] This lack of meaningful differentiation probably results in reductions of magnitudes of association with theoretically relevant explanatory variables. Obviously, we need to strive for a better method of measurement for educational projection levels than now exists.

Measurement of dimensions other than level of status projection have not been adequately developed. Certainty of expectation has been measured using a set of four or five ranked alternatives in a Likert type scale (Appendix E). Intensity of aspiration has been measured infrequently through a rather cumbersome multiple response, forced-choice scale originally developed by Leonard Reissman and subsequently used in modified forms by others.[21] We have attempted to develop a single simplified instrument that would produce measures of intensity for a number of aspiration areas simultaneously. This scale obtains the respondent's ranking of seven goal types relative to the importance he places upon them (Appendix E). The rank order obtained is useful in establishing a hierarchy of goal valuations, but the measurement is too gross to provide adequate differentiation in reference to intensity of aspiration. More work needs to be put into attempts to develop a high quality, multiple item scale for this dimension that is easily administered.

Another aspect of the status element of projections, specificity, which has been assumed to have substantial theoretical significance because of its hypothesized relationship to "realism" and "maturity," has been recently measured by several researchers.[22] In a recent article, we describe a simple procedure for rank ordering open-end responses on criteria of specification of job types (Appendix E). As far as I know, direct measurement of specificity of educational projections has not been attempted, although it seems quite possible by using criteria of specification going beyond simple level indication (i.e., type and quality of school, program of study, etc.).

John Pelham has made a rather unique contribution recently in adapting a measure of status consistency to aspirational and expectational frames of reference.[23] This movement toward a more inclusive framework is deserving of consideration in future research.

EMPIRICAL FINDINGS

Historical Trends in Research Development

Although the earliest study of rural youth's status projections was one begun in Pennsylvania in 1929, the real impetus for investigating status projections of rural youth probably evolved later as a result of Sewell's 1947 Wisconsin effort. Several years later, Slocum began studying these phenomena in the state of Washington. Very few studies were started prior to 1954. The momentum of research on these phenomena increased dramatically after 1955, probably as a result of a report by Lipset contending that rural youth's low aspirations partly explained their disadvantage in social mobility observed in his Oakland study. Shortly after this, a North Central regional group began a series of investigations in several mid-western states. Consequently, most of the early findings on the phenomena were limited to this region and Washington, with the notable exception of Kentucky investigations by Youmans and Schwarzweller and a Florida study by Middleton and Grigg. After 1960 interest in the problem area picked up rapidly and spread out across the United States and, by the mid-sixties, extended into the deep South and Canada. Except for the Middleton and Grigg investigation during the mid-fifties and Drabick's work in 63, very little research had been done in the South proper. However, in 1964 a group of researchers (S-61) developed plans for a longitudinal investigation of status projections of youth residing in rural areas of Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Georgia, South Carolina, and Texas. These investigations were begun in 1966 and as can be observed from the citations listed in Appendix B, the early regional imbalance is being ameliorated to some extent. At the same time several major regions of the country are still not well represented in the findings accumulated thus far--the Southwest and Northeast in particular, Tables 1-16.

Limitations to Broad Generalizations

Because most of the early investigations took place in the Midwest and state of Washington, the existing syntheses and reviews have depended heavily on them and are limited in this respect. However, a number of analyses involving inter-state data are evolving from the S-61 regional project and at least one comprehensive synthesis on occupational projections of Southern rural youth has been developed by Lever in a recent M.S. thesis, Appendix B.

In terms of more specific variables involved in analyses, certain regional emphases or biases appear to exist. While a few variables have been related to status projections very frequently and cover most regions--place of residence, SES, and IQ (Tables 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 12)--others have not. Investigations involving farm-nonfarm comparisons (Tables 2 and 3), values (Table 13) and those relating projection to attainment (Table 16) are mostly limited to the North, including the border state of Kentucky. On the other hand, investigations including race, (Table 7), parental and teacher encouragement (Table 10), types of school participation (Table 11), and self-image(Table 14), tend not to be done in the Midwest. The only useful studies of how status projections change with age are evolving from S-61 in the South (Table 15) and, the few long-run longitudinal studies relating projections to subsequent attainment (Table 16) have been carried out in a few Northern states. Obviously, these regional biases provide limitations for generalizing to the entire society. What is more, very little research that I am aware of exists on this subject outside of the United States, with the exception of a recent spurt from Canada. Attempts at cross-cultural comparisons should be welcomed as a means of broadening the significance of our work.

Certain other research biases are apparent in the literature and point in directions that future research should take. For instance, almost all studies are limited to children enrolled in school and the vast majority are even more

severely restricted to youth in the last two years of high school. Although many reports involve only males, extremely few report on females alone. In order to give you some idea of this sex-age bias, I have indicated these characteristics of study populations summarized in Table 4. Almost no information exists on pre-high school and very little on post-high school rural young people. Obviously we need to strive toward increasing the scope of the population we can generalize to--the neglect of the high school dropouts in our studies is particularly painful.

Certain limitations also exist in attempting to generalize across status projection areas. For instance, the associations of parental and teacher encouragement and self-image are rather well investigated relative to educational projections but not in reference to occupational projections, Tables 10 and 14.

One quite obvious observation is that our research or status projections has tended toward redundancy as concerns some variables, such as residence type and IQ, and relatively ignored others, such as anomia, parent-child role relations, expectations of significant others, perception of opportunity, and others.

Another lack that becomes apparent in overviewing is large body of findings accumulated over two decades, is the almost total absence of attempts at historical analysis. Have aspirations and expectation profiles of rural youth or of farm youth changed over these twenty years? Slocum's recent findings appear to indicate that farm youth's projections have risen and most of us assert this. Yet, we have not used the potential that exists for significant analysis of societal change in this regard, particularly in the wealth of accumulated data from the Midwest.

Factors Influencing Status Projections

In Tables 1 through 14 I have attempted to provide synthesis of a number of variables that have been frequently related to occupational and/or educational projections of rural youth. It goes without saying that other factors have not been included here; for instance, peer influence. Also, it is obvious that I am not going to have the time to produce empirical syntheses relative to all those I have listed in the tables provided; however, it is my hope that the presentations of such materials will whet the appetites of others. In this section I plan to focus my attention on residence differences and justly briefly overview the several other variables presented. But before doing this, I would like to make two critical observations about the general nature of the research summarized in these tables.

First, all too many--in fact--the vast majority of research results presented here were in the form of simple two variable associations or cross-tabulations. Consequently, a large number of variables are found to be consistently related to projection levels in terms of relatively low order association. Secondly, not enough attention is given to providing specific measures of association or degree of relationship--making it extremely difficult to integrate findings beyond simple determination of direction. In conclusion, it appears to me that we need more multivariate analysis providing standardized measures of association. And, in conjunction with this, we need some standardization of measurement criteria. Much of the incompatability of findings, particularly in reference to dramatic differences in magnitude of association between or among any given set of variables, is probably due to variability in measurement. Some prospects for testing this assertion are obvious in results summarized in Tables 5, 6, and 7.

Place of Residence

Most of the research on status projections of rural youth was stimulated by the assumptions that these phenomena importantly influence social mobility and that rural youth, particularly farm youth, have low level aspirations and expectations. As a consequence, place of residence is one of the variables most frequently investigated relative to status projections.

Accumulated findings on rural-urban comparisons of youth projections are summarized in Table 1. The findings indicate that urban youth have generally higher levels of aspirations and expectations than rural youth. However, in many cases the differences observed were not great, particularly for females and Southern Negroes. In addition, analyses including controls for intelligence and SES indicate that residence differences either diminish or, as is usually the case for girls, disappear entirely.

In a paper presented several years ago, that has been largely ignored by my rural sociology colleagues, I attacked the widely held assertion that rural youth have low aspirations.[24] It was, and still is, my contention that rural-urban differences in occupational projections were largely a research artifact resulting from judgments involved in measurement devices and interpretation of statistical test values. By restructuring sets of data from a number of widely dispersed studies, I demonstrated that when farming is viewed as a high level goal, significant rural-urban differences vanish. Sewell, has suggested as much in observing that much of the rural-urban differences observed is probably accountable to by farm boys disproportionately selecting farming as a desired or expected occupation.[25]

Unfortunately most of the studies making farm-nonfarm comparisons of status projections among rural youth are somewhat dated, Table 2. The same is true for the larger group of efforts comparing farm youth with all others (rural and urban)

Table 3. The findings generally show that farm boys have lower level projections than nonfarm boys but that these differences are often not observable for girls. However, recent evidence from a Washington study by Slocum (Table 2, EB-1) and our Texas findings (Appendix E) indicate that this situation has probably changed in reference to education.[26] I think this change can be attributed to the fact that most farm youth have realistically adjusted to the lack of opportunity in farming and no longer orient themselves toward farming as a career--several recent studies in the South indicate that very few rural youth desire or expect to farm.[27]

Evidence summarized in Table 4 (EA-1 through EA-5) from dated research in the Midwest strongly supports the contention that plans to farm are negatively related to plans for college. I propose that this relationship probably does not apply today, in the Midwest or any other region. The few rural youth intending to farm today are most likely those from relatively affluent families that have appreciation for the prestige factor involved in college education and perceive the utility of advanced training for agricultural pursuits.[28] This proposition is congruent with Kaldor and his colleagues' observations from a 1959 study and certainly deserves testing in future research.

Other Variables

SES and Race. Findings summarized on the relationship of SES to occupational status projections of rural youth in Table 5 generally demonstrate a positive association. Although there appears to be some difference in strength of relationship observed, most studies indicate a low order association, particularly for girls and Negroes. With the exception of a study involving expectations by Kaldor, the evidence indicates either no relationship or a weak one between desires to farm and SES (A-4, A-3, A-2, A-5). Findings on the relationship observed between SES and educational status projections are similar, with the exception that a great deal more variability

appears in the observation of strength of association and less difference was observed in this respect between the sexes, Table 6. Studies including place of residence as a control tend to indicate that SES is more strongly associated with projection levels than type of residence.

Race, of course, is an important stratification variable and in the South maybe more important than objectively determined SES. As a consequence, all of the studies located examining racial differences on status projections were done in the South, for the most part since the middle sixties, Table 7. Findings indicate that the association between race and projections tends to be weak--several studies indicate that it disappears when SES and residence are controlled. Of particular significance, the nature of the relationship established between race and projection levels varies consistently by type of status--Negroes have higher educational projections but lower educational projections than whites. In passing, a recent tri-ethnic comparison of Texas youth indicate that Mexican American youth tend to have lower occupational and educational projections in comparison with Negro and white counterparts.[29]

Family Size and Sib Location. The summary of findings presented in Table 8 indicates generally a weak association of family size with status projections. However, almost all of the studies involve only expectations and half of them involve only boys. Most of the few studies summarized in Table 9 indicate a lack of significant relationship between sib location and occupational projections and a positive relationship between sib location and educational projections. However, again, half of these studies involve only boys. Several contradictions in reference to educational projections raise questions about the general validity of the statement made above. The evidence from a few studies indicate that there may be farm-nonfarm and Negro-white differences in the nature and magnitude of these relationships.

Encouragement. Relatively few studies, mostly located in the West and Canada, have examined relationships between parental and teacher encouragement and educational projections--none were located in reference to occupational projections, Table 11. The findings were limited almost entirely to aspirations and appear to indicate a positive relationship. Although these studies show that one or both parents seem to more influential than other persons, Slocum has observed in a recent study that peer influences appear to be gaining in significance.[30]

School Participation. Most of the studies relating school participation to status projections of youth have focused on attendance and participation in extra-curricular activities, indicating that these factors are positively related to level of aspiration and/or expectation. A few studies have shown that vocational training appears to have a moderately negative association with level of occupational aspiration and expectation and plans for college.[31]

Intelligence. The association of intelligence to status projections has been widely studied, Table 12. These studies are largely limited to expectation and indicate a moderate to strong association was observed.

Values. The findings on values and status projections indicate that a number of job values (non-status aspects of occupations) appear to be significantly related to level of aspiration and expectation and, in particular, to farm-nonfarm desires and plans. The relationship of level of projection to preferences for service to society, mental work, association with people, opportunity to be a boss, appear to be positive; whereas, association between projections and values for hard work, security, manipulating things, and familism are negative.

Self-Image. The summary of research relating self-images to educational projections included in Table 14 indicates that most of this work has been centered in the West and in Canada and has been restricted to educational projections.

Whatever type of self-image was examined, a positive relationship with educational expectations (usually college plans) and aspirations was observed.

Longitudinal Studies

Perhaps the greatest overall short-coming of our research on status projections of rural youth has been our failure to examine the dynamics of status projection formation and the linkage of status projections with status mobility. Considering that we have been researching status projections for over twenty years, the relatively small amount of knowledge that we have on these subjects is surprising.

Dynamics of Status Projections

Perhaps the greatest gap in our empirical knowledge about aspirations and expectations of rural youth revolves around their dynamic properties--how and why they change with increasing age. As has been pointed out before, most of our research has been done on 11th and 12th graders and very little attention has been given to pre-high school or post-high school youth. Moreover, the only empirical information we have on these dynamics from longitudinal studies are provided by several unpublished 1969 reports evolving from the S-61 project, Table 15.

An examination of aggregate profiles of youth of different ages, or of aggregate profiles of the same youth at two different points in time, during late adolescence, will show little variation. This has led some researchers to conclude that aspirations and expectations are relatively stable over the high school years.[32] However, the evidence evolving out of the S-61 project indicates that only about half of a sample of Alabama youth maintain consistent occupational projections over a two year period of time (sophomore-senior). Similarly, evidence from a Texas study indicates that about two-thirds of the respondents involved maintained consistency in educational projections over the same period (Appendix E, Tables 3 and 4). What is more, in both cases the changes over time

were about equally divided between those deflected toward higher levels and those deflected toward lower levels. In fact, the Texas data on educational projections appear to indicate that the vast majority of youth holding low level aspirations and expectations in 1966 changed these upward in 1968. The findings of the Alabama and Texas investigations seem to bring into question the phase theory of status projections development offered originally by Ginzberg and his associates and passed on to rural sociologists by Burchinal and his colleagues.[33] The recent findings would indicate that youth do not become more realistic in their aspirations and expectations through high school; conversely, many of them become less realistic. Obviously, we could do with a great deal more theoretically inspired research on this subject.

Projections and Attainment

I do not intend to say more than a few words here about the demonstrated relationship existing between status projections and attainment. Most of you are familiar with the spurt of recent reports on the subject appearing in Rural Sociology, and, I am at present developing a thorough statement on this subject in another paper. However, several observations gleaned from my overview of the literature should be mentioned, Table 16. First of all, there are all too few studies reporting on this relationship to generalize broadly. Yet, two general observations seem to be supported by the evidence that exists: (1) that qualitative and level differences of occupational aspirations are related to the degree with which aspirations are fulfilled in attainment and (2) that educational projections are more highly associated than occupational ones with both occupational and educational attainment.

If we are ever really going to try and understand social mobility, in the sense of explaining it, we will have to give proportionately much more attention to the types of longitudinally designed studies cited in Table 9. The Wisconsin group appears to be pointing the way in their recent path model analyses.[34]

FOOTNOTES

1. Texas A&M University, Department of Agricultural Economics and Sociology, Departmental Information Reports 67-10, 67-11, and 67-12 and Departmental Technical Reports 66-3, 67-2, and 68-3.

2. See citations of Haller's reports given in Appendix A.

3. See citations of Sewell's reports given in Appendix A and Appendix B.

4. See citations of Straus's reports given in Appendix A.

5. See citations of Slocum's reports given in Appendix A and Appendix D.

6. See citations of Schwarzweller's reports given in Appendix A.

7. See Appendix B-Part B, No. 13.

8. Although Ginzberg's developmental theory, postulating stages of more realistic choice through adolescence, has been in existence for almost two decades and was described in a widely read North Central Regional Publication authored by Burchinal, Haller, and Taves in 1962 (Appendix D), no empirical evidence has been generated to evaluate the theory by rural sociologists until several unpublished reported evolved this year (see Table 15). This is surprising in light of the fact that two large scale longitudinal studies starting in 1947 (see Table 16) have been reported on numerous times.

9. See Kuvlesky and Bealer, "A Clarification of the Concept 'Occupational Choice,'" 31 (September, 1966) and Haller, "On the Concept of Aspiration," 35 (December, 1968).

10. See Table 7.

11. In a recent M.S. thesis Juarez presents a modification of the Kuvlesky and Bealer scheme (op. cit.) interjecting the intention element, Appendix B-Part A, No. 3.

12. Appendix B-Part A, No. 30.

13. Appendix B-Part B, No. 13.

14. See critiques provided in the two sets of annotations we have developed on rural youth--cited in Appendix A.

15. Michigan State University, Agricultural Experiment Station, Technical Bulletin 288, 1963, Chapter 3.

16. I am here pointing my finger in passing at possible differences that may be produced by techniques of stimulus presentation. Ellis, for instance, has observed that personal interviews produce more specific responses than mass administered instruments in reference to occupational aspirations. Robert A. Ellis, et al. "Planned and Unplanned Aspects of Occupational Choice By Youth: Toward a Morphology of Occupational Choice." Eugene: The University of Oregon (Mimeo).

17. See the research note by Mirande cited in Appendix B, No. 9.

18. Several years ago Haller sent me a list of about 30 reports of investigations utilizing the OAS instrument. I am sure the number has increased markedly by now.

19. In reference to at least higher SES youth, the distinction between not finishing and finishing four years of college is of great significance and entrance into graduate programs is certainly of some importance.

20. Several recent studies indicate that lower class youth, aspire to post high school vocational training in sizeable proportions and more often than upper class youth (Table 6). Our recent Texas study of low-income rural youth indicates that almost all of them, not aspiring to college graduation, desire or expect post high school training or attendance in a junior college.

21. Studies utilizing this type of instrument are reviewed in Kuvlesky and Bealer, op. cit.

22. See Ellis, op. cit. and Kuvlesky and Jacob, "Specificity of Adolescents Occupational Status Projections:An Empirical Evaluation Based On A Study Of Negro and White Youth", Paper presented at Southern Sociological Society meetings, New Orleans, April, 1969.

23. Appendix B-Part A, No. 30.

24. "Occupational Aspirations and Expectations of Rural Youth: Some Suggestions for Action Programs." Paper presented at the 1969 Association of Southern Agricultural Workers meetings, Jackson, Miss., February, 1969.

25. Cited in Appendix A-Part 1, B-17 (p.37).

26. Findings by ethnicity indicate that the aspiration and expectation profiles of farm and nonfarm youth are almost exactly the same. On the other hand, the Mexican American farm youth tended to desire and expect college graduation with less frequency than their nonfarm counterparts. The fact that proportionately more Negro farm youth both desired and anticipated college graduation than nonfarm youth of any ethnic type, should give caution in making gross statements about farm-nonfarm differences in projections. See Tables 1 and 2 in Appendix E.

27. Appendix A-Part 1, D-3 and D-10.

28. Of course it is possible that the effect of plans to farm on college aspirations could vary by region and in reference to other considerations; however, the determination of such differentials awaits to be researched.

29. Appendix B-Part A, No. 13.

30. Slocum, Career Choices, p. 217. See Appendix D.

31. However, it should be pointed out that several studies indicate that participation in vocational courses during high school are associated in a positive manner with projections for noncollege, post-high school education.

32. Evidence that apparently supports the contention that job projections are stable over high school years but may change markedly immediately afterward is provided in results of a 1955-1962 study of males reported by Ralph La Cascio, "Continuity and Discontinuity in Vocational Development," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 46 (September, 1967), pp. 32-36.

33. See Ginzberg, et al. (Appendix C) and Burchinal, et al. (Appendix D).

TABLES

SUMMARY TABLES OF RESEARCH FINDINGS ON
THE RELATIONSHIP OF OCCUPATIONAL STATUS
PROJECTIONS OF RURAL YOUTH TO OTHER VARIABLES

Because of the difficulty in cramming all the relevant information into these tables, letter and other symbols were used in certain cases. The following explanation of the symbols used in particular columns should be helpful in understanding the table and locating sources of information cited.

(1) Code No.: refers to section identification of report as indicated in Appendix A. The first letter (O or E) indicates which report the annotation of the study appears in--O (Occupational Status Orientations of Rural Youth, Appendix A-1) and E (Educational Status Projections of Rural Youth, Appendix A-2). This device saves extensive duplication of effort in providing citation.

(2) Type of Status Projections: A-aspiration level; E-expectation level; AD-anticipatory goal deflection; C-certainty of expectation; I-intensity of aspiration. In reference to occupational projections, the use of the symbols F and NF refer to farm and nonfarm plans. In reference to educational projections, the use of C refers to college plans and the use of PHS refers to noncollege post high school projections.

(3) Relationship: The nature of comparative differences are indicated by sign (> or <) as are associations (+ or -). The strength of the relationship, when known, is indicated in parentheses following the description of the nature of the association.

(4) Other commonly used symbols such as SES, WC (white collar) or BC (blue collar), R (rural) or U (urban), and F (farm) or NF (nonfarm) are used but should be self-explanatory within the context of their use.

Table 1. Summary of Findings Reported on Rural-Urban Comparisons of Youth Status Projections.

Code No.	Authors of Research	Location and Time	Type of St. Proj.	Relationship of Resid. to Proj.	Controls
A. OCCUPATION					
OD-6	Payne	Ga.,53	E	R < U(-)	Difference > with SES level. Boys.
OD-4	Middleton and Grigg	Fla.,54-55	E	White Boys:R < U Others:None	IQ,SES
OD-2	Grigg and Middleton	Fla.,(?)	E	R < U	Sex,IQ,SES:Differences among boys only persist.
OD-8	Sewell and Orenstein	Wis.,57	E	R < U	Sex,IQ,SES:Differences persist only for boys.
OD-9	Siemens	Can.,64	A	R < U	Sex
OD-3	Kuvlesky and Ohlendorf	Tex.,66	A,E	R < U(-)	Negro boys
			AD	None	
			I	R < U(-)	
	Cosby (69)	South,66	A	R < U(-)	Race,SES
B. EDUCATION					
EB-1	Berdie	Minn.,50-51	E(C)	NM < M(-)	Sex
EB-22	Slocum	Wash.,54	E(C)	R < U(-)	
ED-5	Middleton and Grigg	Fla.,54-55	E(C)	White:R < U Negro:None	Sex,IQ
ED-2	Drabick	N.C.,63	E(C)	NM:OC < T & V	Sex,Race
ED-3	Forcese and Siemens	Can.,64	A	College:R < U Noncollege-PHS:R > U	SES
EB-19	Siemens and Jackson	Can.,64-65	E	R < U	Sex
EB-8	Haller and Wolff	Mich.,57	E	R < U	Boys
ED-6	Siemens	Can.,64	A	R < U	IQ,SES:Residence differences do not persist.
ED-4	Hodgkins and Parr	Can.,65	A	None	Boys,SES

Table 2. Summary of Findings Reported on Farm-Rural Nonfarm Comparisons of Youth's Status Projections.

Code No.	Authors of Research	Location and Time	Type of St. Proj.	Relationship of Resid. to Proj.	Controls and Remarks
A. OCCUPATION					
OB-1	Buck and Bible	Pa.,47	A	None	Sex
OB-3	Cowhig, et al.	Mich.,58	A,E	F < NF	Sex
OB-8	Schwarzweller	Ky.,59	A,E	Boys:F < NF Girls:None	
OB-5	Lindstrom	Ill.,62	A,E	F < NF	Sex, College Plans
B. EDUCATION					
EB-8	Haller and Wolff	Mich.,57	E(C)	None	Boys
EB-16	Schwarzweller	Ky.,59	A,E(C)	Boys:F < NF Girls:None	
EB-24	Youmans	Ky.,57	E(C)	Boys:F < NF(+) Girls:None	Includes H.S. dropouts.
EB-22	Slocum	Wash.,54	E(C)	None	
EB-5	Cowhig, et al.	Mich.,58	E(C)	F < NF	Sex
EB-15	Robin and Sardo	Col.,60	E	College:None Trade:F < NF(str.)	Sex
			CE	F < NF(str.)	
EB-19	Siemens and Jackson	Can.,64-65	E	University:F < NF Techn.Trng.:F > NF	Sex
EB-21	Slocum	Wash.,64-65	A,E(C)	Boys:F > NF Girls:None	School grades

Table 3. Summary of Research Reported on Farm-Nonfarm (Rural-Urban) Comparisons of Youth's Status Projections.

Code No.	Authors of Research	Location and Time	Type of St. Proj.	Relationship of Resid. to Proj.	Controls
A. OCCUPATION					
OB-4	Haller and Sewell	Wis.,47-48	E	None	Sex
OB-12	Youmans	Mich.,(?)	E,A	F < NF(-)	
OB-9	Slocum	Wash.,54	E	Boys:F<NF Girls:None	
OB-2	Burchinal	Iowa,57	E	F < NF	Males,Farm Plans
OB-10	Slocum and Empey	Wash.,52-54	E,A	None	Females
B. EDUCATION					
EB-1	Berdie	Minn.,50-51	E(C)	F < NF	Sex
EB-9	Haller and Sewell	Wis.,47-48	E(C)	F < NF	IQ:Difference remained for only boys.
EB-17	Sewell	Wis.,57	E(C)	F < NF	SES,IQ,Sex:Controls reduced differences.
EB-14	Nam and Cowhig	U.S.,59-60	E(C)	F < NF	
EB-12	Lindstrom	Ill.,62-63	E(C)	F < NF(-)	Full-time Farm < Part-time
EB-6	Cramer, et al.	South,63-64	E(C)	None	Intentions of college students to finish college
EB-13	Lionberger, et al.	Mo.,64-65	E(C)	F < NF	Boys

Table 4. Summary of Findings Reported on Relationship of Occupational Projections to Educational Projections.

Code No.	Authors of Research	Location and Time	Occup. Proj.	Ed. Proj.	Nature of Relationship	Sex-Grade
EA-1	Haller	Wis.,47-48	E(F)	E(C)	-	M(17 yrs.)
EA-2	Haller	Mich.,57	E(F)	E(C)	-	M(17 yrs.)
EA-3	Haller and Sewell	Wis.,57	E(F)	E(Import)	None	M-12
EA-4	Kaldor, et al.	Iowa,59	E(F)	A,E	-	M-12
EB-21	Slocum	Wash.,64-65	A(F)	A,E(C)	None	M-10,11,12
EB-5	Cowhig, et al.	Mich.,58	E(Prof)	E(C)	+(str.)	M,F-12
EB-11	Lindstrom	Ill.,62-63	A	E(C)	+	M,F,-9,10
OB-5	Lindstrom	Ill.,62	A	E(C)	+	M,F,-11,12
EC-7	Lindstrom	Ill.,(?)	A(high)	E(C)	+	M,F,-11,12
OC-10	Robin and Sardo	Col.,(?)	E(WC)	E	+(str.)	M,F,-11,12
*	Slocum (68)	Wash.,64-65	E	E	+(str.)	M,F,-11,12
*	Pelham (68)	Tex.-Ga.,66	A	A	+(str.)	M-10
*	Asbury (68)	Ky.,(?)	A	A,E	+(mod.)	M-8
*	Knapp (69)	Tex.-Ga.,68	E(68)	A,E(68)	W:+(str.) N:variable	M-12

* See Appendix B.

Table 5. Summary of Findings Reported on the Relationship of SES Indicators to Occupational Status Projections of Rural Youth.

Code No.	Authors of Research	Location and Time	SES Variable*	Type of St. Proj.	Relationship	Controls
A-4	Straus	Wash.,54	3	A(F)	+(low)	Farm Boys
A-3	Kaldor, et al.	Iowa,59	3	E(F)	+(str.)	Farm Boys
A-2	Haller	Mich.,57	1,2	A(F)	None	Farm Boys
A-5	Straus	Wis.,59	3	A(F)	None	Farm Boys
B-12	Youmans	Mich.,(?)	1	A,E	+	SES stronger than residence
B-10	Slocum and Empey	Wash.,52-54		A,E	+	Girls(MO***-)
D-8	Sewell and Orenstein	Wis.,57		E	+(str.)	I.Q.,Sex,Place of residence
C-16	Youmans	Ky.,57		A	+	
B-8	Schwarzweller	Ky.,59	1,2,4	A,E	Boys:+ Girls:-	Place of Residence
B-11	Sperry and Kivett	N.C.,59-61	2	A,E	Boys:+ Girls:-	Place of Residence
				AD	-	
D-2	Grigg and Middleton	Fla.,54-55	1	E	+(str.)	I.Q.,Size of Place, Sex
D-7	Rhodes	Tenn.,64	1	A	+	
**	Lever(69)	South,66-67	1	A,E	+(wk.)	
				AD	-(wk.)	Race, Sex.
				C,I	None	
**	Cosby(69)	South,66-67	1,4	A	+(wk)	Race, Residence
**	Knapp(69)	Tex.-Ga.,68	1	E	White:+(mod.) Negro:None	Residence, State, Boys

* 1-Father's Job, 2-LOL, 3-Family Income, 4-Parent's Education

** See Appendix B

***"Mobility Orientation": Level of aspiration relative to level of father's job.

Table 6. Summary of Findings Reported on Relationship of SES Indicators to Educational Status Projections of Rural Youth.

Code No.	Authors of Research	Location and Time	SES Indicator*	Type of St. Proj.	Relationship	Controls
A-4	Kaldor, et al.	Iowa,59	3	E(C)	+(wk)	Farm Boys
B-1	Berdie	Minn.,50-51	3	E(C)	None	Academic Ability(+ for low
			1	E(C)	+	
B-8	Haller and Wolff	Mich.,57	2	E(C)	+	Boys
B-11	Lindstrom	Ill.,62-63	1	E(C)	+	
B-13	Lionberger, et al.	Mo.,6465	1,4	E(C)	+	Boys
B-15	Robin and Sardo	Col.,60	3,4	E	+(wk.)	
B-16	Schwarzweller	Ky.,59	1,2,4	A,E(C)	Boys:+ Girls:None	
B-17	Sewell	Wis.,57	3-4	E(C)	+(str.)	Sex,I.Q.,Residence
B-18	Sharp and Kristjanson	Can.,64	1,2,4	A	University:+ PHS:-	
B-19	Siemans and Jackson	Can.,64-65	2	E(C)	+	
B-21	Slocum	Wash.,64-65	3,4	A,E(C)	+	NM
B-22	Slocum	Wash.,54	1,4	A,E(C)	+	
B-24	Youmans	Ky.,57		E(C)	+	
C-1	Bishop, et.al.	Va.,60-61	2	E(C)	+	Sex
C-2	Christiansen, et.al.	Utah,60	1,3,4	A,E(C)	+(mod.)	
C-5	Jeffrey	Tenn.,60-61	2	E	+	Sex
C-8	Lowe	Mo.,56-60	1	A,E	+	NM
				A D	-(wk.)	
				I	+	
				C	-	
C-12	Southern Committee	South,(?)	2	E(C)	+	Sex
C-13	Sperry and Kivett	N.C.,59-61	2	E	College:+(wk.) Voc.:-	
D-1	Boyle	Can.,62	1,4	E(C)	+(str.)	Present and Past residence. Girls
D-2	Drabick	N.C.(?)	1	E(C)	+	Race, Sex
D-3	Frocese and Siemens	Can.,64		A	+	Residence
D-4	Hodgkins and Parr	Can.,65	1	A(?)	+	Residence
D-6	Siemens	Can.,64	1,4	A(C)	+(str.)	Sex

* 1-Father's Job, 2-LOL, 3-Family Income, 4-Parent's Education

Table 7. Summary of Findings Reported on Relationship of Race to Status Projections of Rural Youth.

Code No.	Authors of Research	Location and Time	Type of St.Proj.	Relationship	Controls
A. OCCUPATION					
ED-5	Middleton and Grigg	Fla.,54-55	E	Boys:None Girls:N<W(-)	SES,I.Q., Residence
OC-9	Nunalee and Drabick	N.C.,63	A,D	N<W(-)	Sex:dif.>for girls
EC-14	Youmans, et.al.	Fla.,62	A	Boys:N<W(-) Girls:N>W(-)	Rural
*	Kuvlesky and Upham	Tex.,66	A I	N<W(-) N<W(-)	Rural Boys. Occup. valued-than ed. but+ than income and residence
*	Ameen(68)	Tex.,66	A E,AD	None N<W(-)	Rural boys
*	Cosby(69)	South,66	A	N<W(mod.)	With controls on SES and Residence, difs. do not exist.
*	Vanlandigham(69)	Miss.,66	A	N<W(+)	Sex
*	Pelham(69)	South,66	A	N<W(-)	Boys, State (Ga.,Tex.,Miss.)
*	Lever(69)	South,66-67	A E AD C,I	N<W(-) Boys:N<W,Girls:N>W Boys:N>W,Girls:N<W None	SES, Sex
B. EDUCATION					
EB-6	Cramer,et.al.	South,63-64	E	College:N<W(-) Voc.:N>W	SES(decreased difs.), Sex, Sib. Loc.
EC-14	Youmans, et.al.	Fla.,62	E	None	Sex
ED-2	Drabick	N.C.,63	E	N>W	Sex
EC-9	Ohlendorf and Kuvlesky	Tex.,66	A,E,AD I,C	N>W (-) None	Sex
*	Kuvlesky and Upham	Tex.,66	A I	N>W(-) None	Boys Ed. Valued more than job, income or residence.
*	Pelham(69)	South,66	A	N>W(-)	Boys, State(Ga.,Tex.,Miss.)

* See Appendix B

Table 8. Summary of Findings Reported on Relationship of Family Size to Status Projections of Rural Youth.

Code No.	Authors of Research	Location and Time	Type of St. Proj.	Relationship	Controls
A. OCCUPATION					
OB-12	Youmans	Mich.,(?)	A,E	None	Boys
OD-10	Youmans	"	E	-(wk.)	Boys
OA-2	Haller	Mich.,57	E(F)	-	Farm Boys
OC-9	Nunalee and Drabick	N.C.,63	AD	-	NM
B. EDUCATION					
EB-10	Landis	Wash.,47	AD	+	
EB-7	Edlefsen and Crowe	Wash.,57	E	-	
EC-13	Sperry and Kivett	N.C.,59-61	E(C)	+(only child)	
EC-1	Bishop, et al.	Va.,60-61	E	-(wk.)	LOL
EB-6	Cramer, et al.	South,63-64	E	None	
EB-13	Lionberger, et al.	Mo.,64-65	E(C)	+(small)	Sex,Race
			E(C)	+(only child)	Boys

Table 9. Summary of Findings Reported on the Relationship of Sib Position to Status Projections of Rural Youth.

Code No.	Authors of Research	Location and Time	Type of St. Proj.	Relationship	Controls
A. OCCUPATION					
OB-12	Youmans	Mich.,(?)	E,A	None	Boys
OD-10	Youmans	Mich,(?)	E	None	Boys
B. EDUCATION					
EB-7	Edlefsen and Crowe	Wash.,57	E(C)	+	
EB-6	Cramer, et al.	South,63-64	E(C)	+ for white - for Negro	Sex
EB-13	Lionberger, et al.	Mo.,64-65	E(C)	+	Stronger for F than NF boy
*	Asbury	Ky.,(?)	A,E	-(wk.)	Boys.

*See Appendix B.

Table 10. Summary of Findings Reported on Parental and Teacher Encouragement For Educational Projections of Rural Youth.

Code No.	Authors of Research	Location and Time	Source of Encouragement	Type of St.Proj.	Relationship	Controls
ED-6	Siemens	Can.,64	Parent	A(Univ.)	+	Sex,SES,I.Q.
EC-8	Lowe	Mo.,56-60	Parent	A,E(C)	WC:Father most BC:Mother most	NM
EC-2	Christiansen, et al.	Utah,60	Parent, Teacher	A(C)	+	
EB-18	Sharp and Kristjanson	Can.,64	Parent	A	University:+ Other PHS:-	
ED-3	Forcese and Siemens	Can.,64	Teacher	A	+	SES
EC-14	Youmans et.al.	Fla.,64	Parent	E	Mother most	Race, Sex
EC-11	Slocum and Garrett	Wash.,64	Teacher	A,E	-	Sex

Table 11. Summary of Findings Reported on Types of School Participation Related to Status Projections of Rural Youth.

Code No.	Authors of Research	Location and Time	School Variable*	Type of St. Proj.	Relationship
A. OCCUPATION					
OC-16	Youmans	Ky.,57	At.	A	+
OC-2	Bertrand and Smith	La.,59	At.	A	+
OB-8	Schwarzweller	Ky.,59	X	A,E	+
OC-5	Drabick	N.C.,63	V(ag)	A,E	-(mod.)
B. EDUCATION					
EB-24	Youmans	Ky.,57	At.	E(C)	+
EB-16	Schwarzweller	Ky.,59	X	A,E(C)	+
EC-2	Christiansen	Utah,60	X	A(C)	+(mod.)
EB-11	Lindstrom	Ill.,62-63	X	E(C)	+
EB-18	Sharp and Kristjanson	Can.,64	At.,X	A(Univ.)	+
ED-3	Forcese and Siemens	Can.,64	X	A	+(str.)
EB-13	Lionberger	Mo.,64-65	X	E(C)	+
**	Slocum (68)	Wash.,65-66	X	E(C)	+
			V	E(C)	-(mod.)

* At-attendance,X-extra curriculas participation, V-vocational training.

** See Appendix 13

Table 12. Summary of Findings Reported on the Relationship of Intelligence (IQ) to Status Projections of Rural Youth.

Code No.	Authors of Research	Location and Time	Type of St. Proj.	Relationship	Controls
A. OCCUPATION					
EA-1	Haller	Wis.,47-48	E(F-NF)	F < NF	Farm Boys
OA-4	Straus	Wash.,54	A(F-NF)	None	Farm Boys
OA-1	Haller	Mich.,57	A(F-NF)	None	Farm Boys
OA-3	Kaldor, et al.	Iowa,59	E(F-NF)	F < NF	Farm Boys
OD-2	Grigg and Middleton	Fla.,54-55	E	+	Rural < Urban
OC-9	Nunalee and Drabick	N.C.,63	AD	-	Not consistent. Race,Sex
OD-8	Sewell and Orenstein	Wis.,57	E	+(str.)	SES,Place of Residence, Sex
B. EDUCATION					
EB-9	Haller and Sewell	Wis.,47-48	E(C)	+	IQ more strongly related than residence.
EB-1	Berdie	Minn.,50-51	E(C)	+	
EB-17	Sewell	Wis.,57	E(C)	+	SES,Place of Residence
EB-24	Youmans	Ky.,57	E(C)	+	
EC-2	Christiansen, et al.	Utah,60	A(C)	+(mod.)	
EB-11	Lindstrom	Ill.,62-63	E(C)	+	
ED-2	Drabick	N.C.,63	E(C)	+(str.)	SES,Race, Sex
ED-3	Forcese and Siemens	Can.,64	A	+(str.)	Persists with SES control.
EB-18	Sharp and Kristjanson	Can.,64	A	University:+ Other PHS:-	

Table 13. Summary of Findings Reported on the Relationship of Values to Status Projections of Rural Youth.

Code No.	Authors of Research	Location and Time	Values	Type of St. Proj.	Relationship	Controls
A. OCCUPATION						
OA-4	Straus	Wash.,54	Work(Things)	A(F-NF)	F > NF	Boys
OA-1	Haller	Mich.,57	Change	A(F-NF)	F < NF	Boys
OA-3	Kaldor, et al.	Iowa,59	Farm Income	E(F-NF)	F < NF	Boys
OA-5	Straus	Wis.,59	Work Ethic	E(F-NF)	F > NF	Synthesis of findings.Boys
OC-12	Schwarzweller	N.Y.,58	Job	A,E	+:service, mental -:hard work, security	Relationships lower for expectations.
OC-11	Schwarzweller	Ky.,59	Multiple	E	+:people, mental, service -:material comfort, service, familism, hard work	Cultural area
B. EDUCATION						
EB-24	Youmans	Ky.,57	Education	E(C)	+	
EC-10	Schwarzweller	N.Y.,58	Job	A,E(C)	+:service -:hard work	
OB-6	Lindstrom	Ill.,62	Job	E(C)	+:occupational rank, opportunity to be boss	
EB-12	Lindstrom	Ill.,62-63	Job	E(C)	+:people -:things	

Table 14. Summary of Research Reported on the Relationship of Self-Images to Educational Projections of Rural Youth.

Code No.	Authors of Research	Location and Time	Self-Image Type	Type of St. Proj.	Relationship	Controls and Remarks
EB-23	Slocum	Wash.,54	Multiple	E(C)	+	Scholarship, Intellectual, Leadership
EB-22	Slocum	Wash.,54	Multiple	E(C)	+	Scholarship, Intellectual, Leadership
EB-6	Cramer, et al.	South,63-64	Social Self-confidence	E(C)	+	
EB-2	Berdie and Hood	Minn.,(?)	Social	E(C)	+	
EB-18	Sharp and Kristjanson	Can.,64	Leadership	A(Univ. only)	+(low)	Same relationship observed for occupational aspirations.
ED-3	Forcese and Siemens	Can.,64	Leadership	A	+	Maintained with SES control.
EB-21	Slocum	Wash.,64-65	Academic	A,E	+	Sex,Residence
*	Slocum(68)	Wash.,64-65	Scholastic Intellectual	E	+(str.)	Sex

*See Appendix B.

Table 15. Change in Status Projections of Rural Youth With Age.

Authors of Research	Location and Time	School Grade	Type of St.Proj.	Findings
A. OCCUPATION				
Thaxton(69)*	Alab.,66-68	10(66)	A,E	For both aggregate profiles very similar, but only about half maintained congruence- the remainder were about equally split between downward and upward change over the two year period.
Knapp(69)*	Tex.-Ga., 66-68	10(66)	E	Aggregate profiles almost identical.
B. EDUCATION				
Kuvlesky**	Tex.,66-68	10(66)	A,E	For both A and E aggregrate profiles are similar, but only about two-thirds maintained congruence. Incongruence rates demonstrated a marked negative correlation with level of 1966 projection and most youth with low level projections in 66 changed them upward by 68.

* See Appendix B.

** Data reported here for the first time:Appendix D, p.16. Nelson Jacob developed the tabulations.

Table 16. Summary of Findings on the Relationship of Status Projections of Rural Youth to Subsequent Attainment.

Authors of Research*	Location and Time	School Class	St. Proj.	Type of Attain.	Assoc.	Remarks
A. OCCUPATIONAL PROJECTIONS						
Buck and Bible (OB-1)	Pa.,47-57	10(47)	A(High)	Ed.(C)	+(str.)	Males > Females
Kuvlesky and Bealer RS(Sept.,67)	Pa.,47-57	10(47)	A	Oc.	+(wk.)	Twenty-three percent of males attained job level desired. However, considerable variability existed by type of 47 aspiration:aspirants for unskilled jobs demonstrated most congruence and aspirants for "glamorous" and managerial the least.
Bohlen and Yoesting RS(June,68)	Iowa,48-56	12(48)	A	Oc.	Male:+(mod.) Female:+(wk.)	Thirty-five percent of males attained job level desired. Rate of congruency varies by 48 aspiration, with farm aspirants having highest level of congruence. Residence, SES, and other variables did not affect the nature of the relationship.
Kohout and Rothney AERJ(Jan.,64)	Wis.,51-61	12(51)	A	Oc.	+(wk.)	Only 14 percent demonstrated congruence. Rate of congruence varied by 51 aspiration with farm and prof. aspirants having highest congruence.
Portes, Sewell, Haller RS(June, 68)	Wis.,57-64	12(57)	A	Oc.	+(mod.)	Aspiration-attainment congruence varies with 57 aspiration. Aspirants for blue collar jobs, professions, and farming had very high rates.
				Ed.(C)	+(mod.)	Blue collar and farm aspirations almost insures respondent will not attend college.
Sewell, Haller, Portes ASR(Feb.,69)	Wis.,57-64	12(57)	A	Oc. Ed.	+(.43) +(.53)	SES, mental ability, farm males

*In addition to those listed here, see citations in Appendix A as follows: Anderson (1.C-1) and Christiansen, et al.(1.C-4).

Table 16 (Cont'd.)

Authors of Research*	Location and Time	School Class	St. Proj.	Type of Attain.	Assoc.	Remarks
B. EDUCATIONAL PROJECTIONS						
Sewell, Haller, Portes ASR(Feb.,69)	Wis.,57-64	12(57)	E(C)	Ed.(C) Oc.	+(.38) +(.61)	Measure of educational attainment--some college vrs. no college. Farm males.
Youmans, et al.	Fla.,62	12(62)	E	Ed.(C)	+	Less than a year. Aggregate statistics indicate that same proportion were in college (40%) as expected to be.
Siemens and Jackson (EB-19)	Can.,64-65	12(64)	E	Ed.(Un.)	+	Congruence varied by residence: U(56%), F(45%), RNF (34-41%). Girls > Boys. SES+. Similar relationships for other PHS plans.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

1. Research Reports Cited in "Occupational Status Orientations of Rural Youth: Structured Annotations and Evaluations of the Research Literature."*

Section No.	Page No.	Citation
A-1	18	Haller, A. O. "Planning Farm: A Social Psychological Interpretation."
A-2	19	Haller, A. O. "The Occupational Achievement Process of Farm-Reared Youth in Urban-Industrial Society."
A-3	20	Kaldor, D. R.; E. Eldridge; L. G. Burchinal; and I. W. Arthur. Occupational Plans of Iowa Farm Boys.
A-4	21	Straus, M. A. "Personal Characteristics and Functional Needs in the Choice of Farming as an Occupation."
A-5	22	Straus, M. A. "Societal Needs and Personal Characteristics in the Choice of Farm, Blue Collar and White Collar Occupations by Farmers' Sons."
B-1	24	Buck, R. C. and B. L. Bible. Educational Attainment Among Pennsylvania Rural Youth.
B-2	25	Burchinal, L. G. "Differences in Educational and Occupational Aspirations of Farm, Small-Town and City Boys."
B-3	26	Cowhig, J. D.; J. Artis; J. A. Beegle; and H. Goldsmith. Orientations Toward Occupation and Residence: A Study of High School Seniors in Four Rural Counties of Michigan.
B-4	27	Haller, A. O. and W. H. Sewell. "Farm Residence and Levels of Educational and Occupational Aspirations."
B-5	28	Lindstrom, D. E. Differences in Academic Capability Between Rural Youth Planning and Not Planning to go to College.
B-6	29	Lindstrom, D. E. "Educational and Vocational Needs of Rural Youth: A Pilot Study."
B-7	30	Nelson, B. H. Attitudes of Youth Toward Occupational Opportunities and Social Services in Cherokee County.
B-8	31	Schwarzweller, H. K. Sociocultural Factors and the Career Aspirations and Plans of Rural Kentucky High School Seniors.
B-9	32	Slocum, W. L. Occupational and Educational Plans of High School Seniors from Farm and Non-Farm Homes.
B-10	33	Slocum, W. L. and L. T. Empey. Occupational Planning by Young Women.
B-11	34	Sperry, I. V. and V. R. Kivett. Educational and Vocational Goals of Rural Youth in North Carolina.
B-12	35	Youmans, E. G. "Social Factors in the Work Attitudes and Interests of 12th Grade Michigan Boys."
C-1	37	Anderson, C. S. Young Men Ten Years After Leaving Pennsylvania Rural High Schools.
C-2	38	Bertrand, A. L. and M. B. Smith. Environmental Factors and School Attendance: A Study in Rural Louisiana.

*Texas A&M University, Department of Agricultural Economics & Sociology, Departmental Technical Report 66-3, September, 1963.

Section No.	Page No.	Citation
C-3	39	Christiansen, J. R.; J. D. Cowhig; and J. W. Payne. Educational and Occupational Aspirations of High School Seniors in Three Central Utah Counties.
C-4	40	Christiansen, J. R.; J. D. Cowhig; and J. W. Payne. Educational and Occupational Progress of Rural Youth in Utah: A Follow-Up Study.
C-5	41	Drabick, L. W. The Vocational Agriculture Student and His Peers.
C-6	42	Kuvlesky, W. P. "Occupational Aspirations and Subsequent Attainment: A Longitudinal Study of Young Adults."
C-7	43	Matthews, R. G. and L. W. Drabick. Reasons for Selection of Expected Occupations: By Race and Sex.
C-8	44	Nelson, B. H. Attitudes of Youth Toward Occupational Opportunities and Social Services in a Six-County Area of the Blacklands.
C-9	45	Nunalee, T. H., III and L. W. Drabick. Occupational Desires and Expectations of North Carolina High School Seniors.
C-10	46	Robin, E. P. and J. Sardo. Attitudes and Plans of High School Students in Sedgwick County, Colorado.
C-11	47	Schwarzweller, H. K. "Values and Occupational Choice."
C-12	48	Schwarzweller, H. K. "Value Orientations in Educational and Occupational Choices."
C-13	49	Scott, H. K. and J. G. Lussier. Background Studies for Resource Development in the Tweed Forest District, Ontario.
C-14	50	Thompson, O. E. "What Are the Plans of Vocational Agriculture Students?"
C-15	51	Waters, E. W. "Vocational Aspirations, Intelligence, Problems and Socio-Economic Status of Rural Negro High School Seniors on the Eastern Shore of Maryland, Their Implications for Vocational Guidance."
C-16	52	Youmans, E. G. The Educational Attainment and Future Plans of Rural Youths.
C-17	53	Youmans, E. G.; S. E. Grigsby; and H. C. King. After High School What: Highlights of a Study of Career Plans of Negro and White Rural Youth in Three Florida Counties.
D-1	55	Edlefsen, J. B. and M. J. Crowe. Teen-Agers' Occupational Aspirations.
D-2	56	Grigg, C. M. and R. Middleton. "Community of Orientation and Occupational Aspirations of Ninth Grade Students."
D-3	57	Kuvlesky, W. P. and G. W. Ohlendorf. "Occupational Status Orientations of Negro Boys."
D-4	58	Middleton, R. and C. M. Grigg. "Rural-Urban Differences in Aspirations."
D-5	59	Nelson, R. C. "Knowledge and Interests Concerning Sixteen Occupations Among Elementary and Secondary School Students."
D-6	60	Payne, R. "Development of Occupational and Migration Expectations and Choices Among Urban, Small Town, and Rural Adolescent Boys."

Section No.	Page No.	Citation
D-7	61	Rhodes, L. "Anomia, Aspiration, and Status."
D-8	62	Sewell, W. H. and A. M. Orenstein. "Community of Residence and Occupational Choice."
D-9	63	Siemens, L. B. The Influence of Selected Family Factors on the Educational and Occupational Aspiration Levels of High School Boys and Girls.
D-10	64	Youmans, E. G. "Occupational Expectations of Twelfth Grade Michigan Boys."

2. Research Reports Cited in "Educational Status Projections of Rural Youth: Annotations of the Research Literature."*

Section No.	Page No.	Citation
A-1	14	Haller, A. O. "The Influence of Planning to Enter Farming on Plans to Attend College."
A-2	15	Haller, A. O. "The Occupational Achievement Process of Farm-Reared Youth in Urban-Industrial Society."
A-3	16	Haller, A. O. and W. H. Sewell. "Occupational Choices of Wisconsin Farm Boys."
A-4	17	Kaldor, D. R.; E. Eldridge; L. G. Burchinal; and I. W. Arthur. Occupational Plans of Iowa Farm Boys.
A-5	18	Moore, E. J.; E. L. Baum; and R. B. Glasgow. Economic Factors Influencing Educational Attainments and Aspirations of Farm Youth.
B-1	20	Berdie, R. F. "Why Don't They Go to College?"
B-2	21	Berdie, R. F. and A. B. Hood. "Personal Values and Attitudes as Determinants of Post-High School Plans."
B-3	22	Case, H. M. "College as a Factor in Occupational Choice: A Study of Different Perceptions by Farm and Nonfarm Youth."
B-4	23	Cowhig, J. D. and C. B. Nam. "Educational Status, College Plans, and Occupational Status of Farm and Nonfarm Youths: October, 1959."
B-5	24	Cowhig, J.; J. Artis; J. A. Beegle; and H. Goldsmith. Orientations Toward Occupation and Residence: A Study of High School Seniors in Four Rural Counties of Michigan.
B-6	25	Cramer, M. R.; C. E. Bowerman; and E. Q. Campbell. Social Factors in Educational Achievement and Aspirations Among Negro Adolescents.
B-7	26	Edlefsen, J. B. and M. J. Crowe. Teen-Agers' Occupational Aspirations.
B-8	27	Haller, A. O. and C. E. Wolff. "Personality Orientations of Farm, Village, and Urban Boys."
B-9	28	Haller, A. O. and W. H. Sewell. "Farm Residence and Levels of Educational and Occupational Aspiration."
B-10	29	Landis, P. H. Teenage Adjustments in Large and Small Families: Comparisons Within a High School and College Sample in Washington.
B-11	30	Lindstrom, D. E. Differences in Academic Capability Between Rural Youth Planning and Not Planning to Go to College.
B-12	31	Lindstrom, D. E. "Educational Needs of Rural Youth."
B-13	32	Lionberger, H. F. and C. L. Gregory with H. C. Chang. Occupational and College Choices of Farm and Nonfarm Male High School Seniors in Missouri.

*Texas A&M University, Department of Agricultural Economics & Sociology, Departmental Technical Report 68-3, October, 1968.

Section No.	Page No.	Citation
B-14	33	Nam, C. B. and J. D. Cowhig. "Factors Related to College Attendance of Farm and Nonfarm High School Graduates: 1960."
B-15	34	Robin, E. P. and J. Sardo. Attitudes and Plans of High School Students in Sedgwick County, Colorado.
B-16	35	Schwarzweller, H. K. Sociocultural Factors and the Career Aspirations and Plans of Rural Kentucky High School Seniors.
B-17	36	Sewell, W. H. "Community of Residence and College Plans."
B-18	37	Sharp, E. F. and G. A. Kristjanson. Manitoba High School Students and Dropouts: Their Educational and Occupational Goals.
B-19	38	Siemens, L. B. and J. E. W. Jackson. Educational Plans and Their Fulfillment: A Study of Selected High School Students in Manitoba.
B-20	39	Siemens, L. B. and L. Driedger. Some Rural-Urban Differences Between Manitoba High School Students.
B-21	40	Slocum, W. L. Educational Aspirations and Expectations of Students in the Rural Washington High Schools.
B-22	41	Slocum, W. L. "Educational Planning by High School Seniors."
B-23	42	Slocum, W. L. Occupational and Educational Plans of High School Seniors from Farm and Nonfarm Homes.
B-24	43	Youmans, E. G. The Educational Attainment and Future Plans of Kentucky Rural Youths.
C-1	45	Bishop, C.; B. Davis; L. J. Harper; and V. C. Payne. Educational and Vocational Goals of Rural Youth in Virginia.
C-2	46	Christiansen, J. R.; J. W. Payne; and K. J. Brown. "Church Participation and College Desires of Rural Youth in Utah."
C-3	47	Christiansen, J. R.; J. D. Cowhig; and J. W. Payne. Educational and Occupational Aspirations of High School Seniors in Three Central Utah Counties.
C-4	48	Christiansen, J. R.; J. D. Cowhig; and J. W. Payne. Educational and Occupational Progress of Rural Youth in Utah: A Follow-Up Study.
C-5	49	Jeffrey, B. I. Educational and Vocational Goals of Rural Youth and Their Parents in Tennessee.
C-6	50	Juarez, R. Z. and W. P. Kuvlesky. "Ethnic Group Identity and Orientations Toward Educational Attainment: A Comparison of Mexican American and Anglo Boys."
C-7	51	Lindstrom, D. E. "Factors Related to the Education and Job Plans of Rural Youth."
C-8	52	Lowe, J. L. "Educational and Occupational Aspirations of High School Seniors: II."
C-9	53	Ohlendorf, G. W. and W. P. Kuvlesky. "Racial Differences in the Educational Orientations of Rural Youth."
C-10	54	Schwarzweller, H. K. "Value Orientations in Educational and Occupational Choices."
C-11	55	Slocum, W. L. and G. R. Garrett. Educational and Occupational Aspirations and Expectations of Rural Youth.

Section No.	Page No.	Citation
C-12	56	Southern Regional Committee for Family Life. Educational and Vocational Goals of Rural Youth in the South.
C-13	57	Sperry, I. V. and V. R. Kivett. Educational and Vocational Goals of Rural Youth in North Carolina.
C-14	58	Youmans, E. G.; S. E. Grigsby; and H. C. King. After High School What? Highlights of a Study of Career Plans of Negro and White Rural Youth in Three Florida Counties.
D-1	60	Boyle, R. P. "Community Influence on College Aspirations: An Empirical Evaluation of Explanatory Factors."
D-2	61	Drabick, L. W. Marriage Plan and Migration Intent: Factors Associated with Expectations.
D-3	62	Forcese, D. P. and L. B. Siemens. School-Related Factors and the Aspiration Levels of Manitoba Senior High School Students.
D-4	63	Hodgkins, B. J. and A. Parr. "Educational and Occupational Aspirations Among Rural and Urban Male Adolescents in Alberta."
D-5	64	Middleton, R. and C. M. Grigg. "Rural-Urban Differences in Aspirations."
D-6	65	Siemens, L. B. The Influence of Selected Family Factors on the Educational and Occupational Aspiration Levels of High School Boys and Girls.

APPENDIX B

Bibliography of Recent Research Reports
Involving Occupational and Educational
Projections of Rural Youth

A. S-61 Reports on Status Projections of Youth

State Data

(O)* 1. Alam, B. A. "Perception of Opportunity and Occupational Expectation: A Racial Comparison of Rural Youth." Proceedings of the Southwestern Sociological Association Meeting, 1968.

(O) 2. Ameen, B. A. "Occupational Status Orientations and Perceptions of Opportunity: A Racial Comparison of Rural Youth from Depressed Areas." Unpublished Master's Thesis, College Station: Texas A&M University, January, 1968.

(E) 3. Juarez, R. Z. "Educational Status Orientations of Mexican American and Anglo American Youth in Selected Low-Income Counties of Texas." Unpublished Master's Thesis, College Station: Texas A&M University, August, 1968.

(E) 4. Juarez, R. Z. and W. P. Kuvlesky. "Ethnic Group Identity and Orientations Toward Educational Attainment: A Comparison of Mexican and Anglo Boys." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southwestern Sociological Association, Dallas, Texas, April, 1968.

(E,I,R,O) 5. Kuvlesky, W. P. "Problems of Rural Youth in the South: Frames of Aspirational Reference, Anticipatory Goal Deflection, and Perception of Opportunity." Presented at the Association of Southern Agricultural Workers meeting, Louisville, Kentucky, February, 1968.

(O) 6. Kuvlesky, W. P. and M. F. Lever. "Occupational Goals, Expectations, and Anticipatory Goal Deflection Experienced by Negro Girls Residing in Low-Income Rural and Urban Places." Proceedings, Southwestern Sociological Association meeting, 1967.

(O,F) 7. Kuvlesky, W. P., A. S. Obordo, and J. D. Preston. "Racial Differences in Teen-Age Girls' Orientations Toward Marriage: A Study of Youth Living in an Economically Depressed Area of the South." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Southern Sociological Society, New Orleans, April, 1969.

*The letter in parenthesis indicates the type of status projection involved as follows: O, occupation; E, education; I, income; F, family; R, place of residence.

(O,E) 19. Vanlandingham, C. L. "Relationships of Occupational Aspirations of Youth to Selected Social Variables in Two Mississippi Counties." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Mississippi State University, 1969.

(O) 20. Wages, S., K. Thomas, and W. P. Kuvlesky. "Mexican American Teen-Age School Dropouts: Reasons for Leaving School and Orientations Toward Subsequent Educational Attainment." Paper presented at the Southwestern Sociological Association meetings, Houston, April, 1969.

(O) 21. Wright, D. E., Jr. "Occupational Orientations of Mexican American Youth in Selected Texas Counties." Unpublished Master's Thesis, College Station: Texas A&M University, 1968.

(O) 22. Wright, D. E. and W. P. Kuvlesky. "Occupational Status Projections of Mexican American Youth Residing in the Rio Grande Valley." Proceedings, Southwestern Sociological Association meeting, 1968.

Interstate Data

(O) 23. Cosby, A. G. "The Disadvantaged Student, Goal-Blockage, and the Occupational Aspirations of Southern Youth." Paper prepared for the Association of Agricultural Workers, Mobile, Alabama, February, 1969.

(O) 24. Cosby, A. G. "Structural Disparity and the Level of Occupational Aspirations of Southern Youth." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Mississippi State University, 1969.

(O) 25. Lever, M. F. "Selected Occupational Status Projections of Southern Youth: An Analysis by Sex, Race, and Socio-Economic Status." Unpublished Master's Thesis, College Station: Texas A&M University, January, 1969.

(O,E,I) 26. Pelham, J. T. "An Analysis of Status Consistency of the Projected Frames of Reference: A Racial Comparison of Males in Selected Low-Income Areas of the Rural South." Unpublished Master's Thesis, College Station: Texas A&M University, January, 1968.

(O,E,I) 27. Pelham, J. T. "Inter-State Differences in Educational, Occupational, and Income Status Aspirations of Southern Rural Males." Paper presented at the Association of Southern Agricultural Workers meetings, Mobile, Alabama, February, 1969.

(O,E) 28. Knapp, Melvin. "Mobility Aspirations and Expectations of Southern Youth." Association of Southern Agricultural Workers, Mobile, Alabama, February, 1969.

(O) 29. Lever, M. F. and W. P. Kuvlesky. "Socio-Economic Status and Occupational Status Projections of Southern Youth, By Race and Sex." Rural Sociological Society Meetings, San Francisco, 1969.

(O) 8. Kuvlesky, W. P. and G. W. Ohlendorf. "Occupational Status Orientations of Negro Boys: A Rural-Urban Comparison." Paper presented at annual Rural Sociological Society meetings, Miami Beach, August, 1966. (Replaced by article in Rural Sociology, 33)

(O) 9. Kuvlesky, W. P. and G. W. Ohlendorf. "A Rural-Urban Comparison of the Occupational Status Orientations of Negro Boys," Rural Sociology, 33 (June, 1968), pp. 141-152.

(R) 10. Kuvlesky, W. P. and J. Pelham. "Community of Residence Aspirations and Expectations of Rural Youth: Implications for Action." Proceedings, Association of Southern Agricultural Workers meeting, 1967.

(O,E,I,R) 11. Kuvlesky, W. P., K. Thomas, and B. Campbell. "Social Ambitions of Negro Boys and Girls from a Metropolitan Ghetto." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Texas Academy of Science, Arlington, Texas, 1969.

(O,E,I,R) 12. Kuvlesky, W. P. and W. K. Upham. "Social Ambitions of Teen-Age Boys Living in an Economically Depressed Area of the South: A Racial Comparison." Paper presented at the Southern Sociological Society meetings, Atlanta, Georgia, March, 1967.

(E,O) 13. Kuvlesky, W. P., D. E. Wright, and R. Z. Juarez. "Status Projections and Ethnicity: A Comparison of Mexican American, Negro, and Anglo Youth." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Southwestern Sociological Association, New Orleans, April, 1969.

(O,I,F) 14. Obordo, A. S. "Status Orientations Toward Family Development: Racial Comparison of Adolescent Girls from Low-Income Rural Areas." Unpublished Master's Thesis, College Station: Texas A&M University, January, 1968.

(E) 15. Ohlendorf, G. W. "Educational Orientations of Rural Youth in Selected Low-Income Counties of Texas." Unpublished Master's Thesis, College Station: Texas A&M University, May, 1967.

(E) 16. Ohlendorf, G. W. and W. P. Kuvlesky. "Racial Differences in the Educational Orientations of Rural Youth." Proceedings, Southwestern Sociological Association meeting, 1967. (Replaced by Social Science Quarterly, September, 1968)

(E) 17. Ohlendorf, G. W. and W. P. Kuvlesky. "Racial Differences in the Educational Orientations of Rural Youth," Social Science Quarterly, 49 (September, 1968), pp. 274-283.

(O,E) 18. Thaxton, S. S. "Occupational Status Orientations of Northeast Alabama High School Boys: A Longitudinal Perspective." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Auburn University, 1969.

30. Pelham, J. T. "Status Consistency of the Projected Frames of Reference of Rural Males." Rural Sociological Society Meetings, August, 1969, San Francisco.

(O) 31. Kuvlesky, W. P. "Generalizations About the Relationship of Occupational Aspirations to Subsequent Attainment, Rural Sociology, 34 (March, 1969), pp. 95-97.

B. Other Research Reports on Projections of Youth Not Listed in Our Previous Bibliographies.

(O,E) 1. Asbury, F. A. "Vocational Development of Rural Disadvantaged Eighth-Grade Boys," The Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 17 (December, 1968), pp. 109-113.

(O) 2. Bohlen, J. M. and D. R. Yoesting. "Congruency Between Occupational Aspirations and Attainments of Iowa Young People," Rural Sociology, 33 (June, 1968), pp. 207-213.

(O,E) 3. Bowles, R. T. and W. L. Slocum. Social Characteristics of High School Students Planning to Pursue Post High School Vocational Training. Washington Agricultural Experiment Station, College of Agriculture, Washington State University, Bulletin 702, November, 1968.

(E) 4. Davis, E. "Some Aspects of Teen-Age Image of High Education," Social Science Quarterly, 49 (September, 1968), pp. 262-273.

(E,O) 5. Drabick, L. W. Perceived Sources of Influence Upon Occupational and Educational Expectations. Raleigh: North Carolina State University, Department of Agricultural Education, Sociology, and Anthropology, Educational Research Series, No. 8, 1967.

(O,E) 6. Eaddy, V. S. "The Influence of Selected Factors on the Vocational Choices of Vocational Agricultural Students in Louisiana." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Louisiana State University, 1968.

(O,E) 7. Gregory, C. L. and H. F. Lionberger. Occupational and Educational Plans of Male High School Seniors: A Study Conducted in Missouri Country, Town, and Small City Locations, 1964. Columbia: University of Missouri, College of Agriculture, Agricultural Experiment Station, Research Bulletin 937, April, 1968.

8. Haller, A. O. "On The Concept of Aspiration," Rural Sociology, 33 (December, 1968), pp. 484-487.

(O) 9. Mirande, A. M. "On Occupational Aspirations and Job Attainments," Rural Sociology, 33 (September, 1968), pp. 349-353.
(See also the reply by Bealer and Kuvlesky in the same issue, pp. 353-356)

(E) 10. Ohlendorf, G. W. and W. P. Kuvlesky. "Racial Differences in the Educational Orientations of Rural Youths," Social Science Quarterly, 49 (September, 1968), pp. 274-283.

(O) 11. Portes, A., A. O. Haller, and W. H. Sewell. "Professional-Executive vs. Farming as Unique Occupational Choices," Rural Sociology, Vol. 33, No. 2 (June, 1968), pp. 153-159.

(O,E) 12. Schwarzweller, H. K. "Community of Residence and Career Choices of German Rural Youth," Rural Sociology, 33 (March, 1968), pp. 46-63.

(E) 13. Sewell, W. H., A. O. Haller, and A. Portes. "The Educational and Early Occupational Attainment Process," American Sociological Review (February, 1969), pp. 82-92.

(E,O) 14. Sharp, E. F. and G. A. Kristjanson. Manitoba High School Students and Drop-Outs: Their Educational and Occupational Goals. Manitoba Department of Agriculture.

(O,I) 15. Shill, J. F. Careers of Rural Male High School Seniors in Mississippi: A Study of Occupational Interests, Aspirations, and Expectations. Educational Series 5, Report 26, October, 1968.

(E) 16. Shill, J. F. Educational Aspirations, Expectations, and Abilities of Rural Male High School Seniors in Mississippi. Mississippi State University, Social Science Research Center, Education Series 4, Report 24, May, 1968.

(E,O) 17. Sperry, I. V. and A. E. Herrin. Goals of Rural and Urban Youth in North Carolina. Greensboro, North Carolina, North Carolina Agricultural Experiment Station, Technical Bulletin No. 186, December, 1967.

(E,O) 18. Yoesting, D.R., J. M. Bohlen, and R. D. Warren. "A Longitudinal Study of Occupational Aspirations and Attainments of Iowa Young Adults." Paper presented at Rural Sociological Society Meetings, Boston, Massachusetts, August, 1968.

19. Gasson, R. "The Choice of Farming as an Occupation," Sociologica Ruralis, 9 (1969), pp. 146-166.

20. Lu, Y. "Educational and Occupational Plans of Farm Boys in 1967." Paper presented at the Southern Agricultural Workers Meetings, Mobile, Alabama, February, 1969.

APPENDIX C

A Listing of Literature Pertaining to Theories Relevant for Status Projections of Youth.*

Bell, G. D. "Processes in the Formation of Adolescents' Aspirations," Social Forces, 42 (December, 1963), pp. 179-186.

Blau, P. M., et al. "Occupational Choice: A Conceptual Framework," Industrial and Labor Relations Review, (July, 1956).

Carkhuff, R. R., et al. "Do We Have a Theory of Vocational Choice," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 46 (December, 1967), pp. 335-345.

Clinard, M. B. (Ed.). Anomie and Deviant Behavior: A Discussion and Critique. New York: The Free Press, 1964.

Cofer, C. N. and M. H. Appley. Motivation: Theory and Research. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967, (Chapters 1, 15, and 16).

Coulson, et al. "Towards a Sociological Theory of Occupational Choice--A Critique," Sociological Review, 15 (November, 1967).

Ellis, R. A. and W. C. Lane. "Social Mobility and Social Isolation: A Test of Sorokin's Dissociative Hypothesis," American Sociological Review, 32 (April, 1967), pp. 237-253.

Faris, R. E. L. "Reflections on the Ability Dimension in Human Society," American Sociological Review, 26 (December, 1961), pp. 835-843.

Ford, J. and S. Box. Sociological Theory and Occupational Choice," Sociological Review, 15 (November, 1967).

Gordon, M. M. "Assimilation in America: Theory and Reality," Daedalus, (Spring, 1961), pp. 263-285.

Hilton, T. L. "Career Decision Making," Journal of Counseling Psychology, (Winter, 1962), pp. 291-298.

Holland, J. L. The Psychology of Vocational Choice. Waltham, Mass.: Blaisdell Publishing Company, 1966.

Kahl, J. A. The American Class Structure. New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1953, (Chapters 7 and 8).

Merton, R. K. "Social Structure and Anomie," Social Theory and Social Structure (revised and enlarged edition). Glencoe: The Free Press, 1957.

*I make no claim that this listing is in any sense complete. It simply represents a selection of what are in my opinion important statements of theory that are usually ignored in the research of rural sociologists.

Musgrave, P. W. "Continuities in the Sociological Theory of Occupational Choice: A Note," Sociological Review, 16 (March, 1968).

Musgrave, P. W. "Towards a Sociological Theory of Occupational Choice," Sociological Review, 15 (March, 1967).

Parsons, T. "A Revised Analytical Approach to the Theory of Stratification," Essays in Sociological Theory (revised edition). New York: The Free Press, 1964.

Parsons, T. Social Structure and Personality. New York: The Free Press, 1964, (Chapters 7 and 8).

Parsons, T. and E. A. Shils (Eds.). Toward a General Theory of Action. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1954, pp. 383-433.

Parsons, T. and R. F. Bales. Family, Socialization and Interaction Process. New York: The Free Press, 1955, (Chapter 3).

Rodman, H. "The Lower-Class Value Stretch," Social Forces, 42 (December, 1963), pp. 205-215.

Roe, A. The Psychology of Occupations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964.

Rosen, B. C. "Race, Ethnicity, and the Achievement Syndrome," American Sociological Review, 26 (February, 1959), pp. 47-60.

Sherif, M. and C. W. Sherif. Reference Groups: Exploration into Conformity and Deviation of Adolescents. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1964.

Stephenson, R. M. "Realism of Vocational Choice: A Critique and an Example," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 35 (April, 1957), pp. 482-488.

Super, D. E. The Psychology of Careers. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1957.

Super, D. E. "A Theory of Vocational Development," The American Psychologist, 8 (May, 1953), pp. 185-190.

Tiedeman, D. V. "Decision and Vocational Development: A Paradigm and Its Implications," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 40 (September, 1961), pp. 15-21.

Turner, R. H. The Social Context of Ambition. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1964.

Yinger, M. J. "Contraculture and Subculture," American Sociological Review, 25 (October, 1960), pp. 625-635.

APPENDIX D

Published Syntheses of Research on Occupational and/or Educational Projections of Rural Youth.

Burchinal, L. G., A. O. Haller, and M. T. Taves. Career Choices of Rural Youth in a Changing Society. St. Paul: Minnesota Agricultural Experiment Station, Bulletin 458 (NCRP No. 142) November, 1962.

Burchinal, L. G. (Ed.). Rural Youth in Crisis: Facts, Myths, and Social Change. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare Administration, 1965, Chpt. 10, "Educational and Occupational Perspectives of Farm and Rural Youth." Based on papers by Sewell and Haller.

Haller, A. O. "Occupational Choices of Rural Youth," Journal of Cooperative Extension, (Summer, 1966), pp. 93-102.

Slocum, W. L. Occupational Careers. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1966, (Chapter 11).

Straus, M. A. "Societal Needs and Personal Characteristics in the Choice of Farm, Blue Collar, and White Collar Occupations by Farmers' Sons," Rural Sociology, 29 (December, 1964), pp. 408-425.

Taylor, L. Urban-Rural Problems. Belmont, Calif.: Dickenson Publishing Company, Inc., 1968, (Chapter 2).

Taylor, L. Occupational Sociology. New York: Oxford University Press, 1968, (Chapter 8).

APPENDIX E

Supplementary Tables of Preliminary Findings
From a Recent Texas Study of Rural Youth

Table 1. Educational Aspirations of Texas Rural Youth by Ethnicity and Farm-Nonfarm Residence.

Educational Aspirations	Negro		Anglo		Mexican American		Total	
	Farm (N=69)	Nonfarm (N=127)	Farm (N=75)	Nonfarm (N=200)	Farm (N=51)	Nonfarm (N=540)	Farm (N=195)	Nonfarm (N=867)
	Percent							
Quit school	1	4	1	4	0	0	1	1
Complete high school	1	2	9	8	25	20	11	14
High scho. grad. + Voc. trg.	35	34	35	30	33	14	34	21
Junior college grad.	4	6	7	10	4	13	5	11
College grad.	23	24	32	34	16	32	25	31
College grad. + add. studies	35	32	16	15	22	20	24	21
TOTAL	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Table 2. Educational Expectations of Texas Rural Youth by Ethnicity and Farm Residence.

Educational Expectation	Negro		Anglo		Mexican American		Total	
	Farm (N=69)	Nonfarm (N=127)	Farm (N=76)	Nonfarm (N=199)	Farm (N=51)	Nonfarm (N=541)	Farm (N=196)	Nonfarm (N=867)
Quit school	6	6	1	2	0	1	3	2
Complete high school	1	3	17	14	31	31	15	23
High scho. grad. + Voc. trg.	33	33	36	37	31	16	34	24
Junior college grad.	1	6	9	7	8	13	6	11
College grad.	28	32	33	31	18	31	27	31
College grad. + add. studies	30	20	4	9	12	8	15	10
TOTAL	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Table 3. Congruency of Texas Rural Youth's Educational Aspirations from Sophomore to Senior Year (1966-68).

1966 Aspiration	Congruence of 1966 and 1968 Aspirations		
	Congruent	Incongruent	N
	----------Percent----------		
High School or Less	31	69	45
High School+ *	61	39	155
College Graduate	76	24	228
Total Respondents	66	34	428
No Information			5

Table 4. Congruency of Texas Rural Youth's Educational Expectations from Sophomore to Senior Year (1966-1968).

1966 Expectation	Congruence of 1966 and 1968 Expectations		
	Congruent	Incongruent	N
	----------Percent----------		
High school or less	37	63	97
High school + Voc. *	62	38	164
College graduate	78	22	170
Total Respondents	62	38	431
No Information			2

*Post high school vocational training or junior college.

APPENDIX E

Measurement Instruments*

1. Scale measuring degree of certainty of job expectation:

(A) Sometimes we are not always able to do what we want most. What kind of job do you <u>really expect</u> to have most of your life? (Write your answer in the box below. Please give an exact job!)

ANSWER: [ ]

(B) How certain are you that this is the job you <u>will have</u> most of your life? (Circle one number):

I am:	1	2	3	4	5
	Very Certain	Certain	Not Very Certain	Uncertain	Very Uncertain

2. Scale producing rank values used to indicate intensity of aspiration associated with particular status goals.

Listed below are a number of things that most young people look forward to. Rank them in order of their importance to you. For the one you think is most important put a number 1 in front of it; for the next most important one put a number 2; and so on until you have a different number (from 1 to 7) for each one. <u>Read over the entire list before answering the question</u>.

_____ To have lots of free time to do what I want.

_____ To get all the education I want.

_____ To earn as much money as I can.

_____ To get the job I want most.

_____ To live in the kind of place I like best.

_____ To have the kind of house, car, furniture, and other things like this I want.

_____ To get married and raise a family.

CHECK YOUR ANSWERS! You should have used each number from 1 to 7 <u>only one time</u> and you should have a number <u>in each blank space</u>.

*These have been used in several states (Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, Louisiana, South Carolina and Texas) cooperating in "Objective C" of USDA regional research project S-61, "Human Resource Development and Mobility in the Rural South."

3. Description of scale used to measure specificity of status elements involved in occupational projections.*

Occupational Status Projection Specificity
Scale: Description and Examples

Score	Response Category	Example of Responses
1	No Useable Information	no response or don't know
2	Very Vague	helping people, steady job, working in a good place
3	Industry	office work, armed forces, business, ranching, light company
4	General Job Category	secretary, teacher, mechanic, nurse, engineer
5	General Job Category + (with location of company)	secretary at Sears, Navy nurse, teacher in Dallas, elementary school teacher
6	Specific Job Title	automobile mechanic, Spanish teacher, electronics technician, psychiatrist, registered nurse
7	Specific Job Title + (with location or company)	mechanical engineer with NASA, jet pilot in the Air Force, bookkeeper of a grocery store

*For a discussion of conceptual clarification of "specificity of occupational choice" and a bibliography of relevant materials, see Kuvlesky and Nelson (69) - Appendix B.